

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Prior to entry of this response, Claims 1-22 were pending in the application, of which Claims 1, 12, and 19 are independent. In the Office Action dated June 29, 2007, Claims 10, 17-18, and 21-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101, Claims 6 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Claims 1, 10, and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), and Claims 2, 5-9, 12, and 17-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Claims 19-20 were allowed. Following this response, Claims 1-4, 7-8, and 10-22 remain in this application with Claim 5-6 and 9 being canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants hereby address the Examiner's rejections in turn.

I. Interview Summary

Applicants thank Examiner Basehoar for the courtesy of a telephone interview on September 18, 2007, requested by the undersigned to discuss the rejection of the current claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and under 35 U.S.C. § 103. During the interview, Applicants asserted that the cited references do not anticipate or render obvious the claims as currently amended. No agreement was reached regarding patentability.

II. Rejection of the Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

In the Office Action dated June 29, 2007, the Examiner rejected Claims 10, 17-18, and 21-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 10, 17-18, and 21-22 have been amended and Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments overcome this rejection and add no new matter.

III. Rejection of the Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 6 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicants regard as their invention. Claims 6 and 9 have been canceled, and Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection has been rendered moot.

IV. Rejection of the Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 10, and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,745,910 ("*Piersol*"). Claim 1 has been amended, and Applicants respectfully submit that the amendment overcomes this rejection and adds no new matter.

Amended Claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the reason that it recites, for example, "determining whether the requested formatting operation is permitted, wherein determining whether the requested formatting operation is permitted comprises determining whether the new content contains at least one style that is not permitted to be applied to the contents of the electronic document."

In contrast, *Piersol* at least does not disclose the aforementioned recitation. For example, *Piersol* merely discloses that individual parts can be protected with limited access rights. (See col. 18, lines 40-41.) For example, in *Piersol*, a document containing several different parts may be intended for distribution to a number of different categories of people. (See col. 18, lines 41-43.) Some of the parts in *Piersol* may contain confidential information that is not to be revealed to some categories of people. (See col. 18, lines 43-46.) These individual parts in *Piersol* can be protected with limited access rights, and their contents can be viewed only by those who have an appropriate password, or other form of access. (See col. 18, lines 46-49.) In other words, *Piersol's* access restrictability is another characteristic property of a part. (See col. 18, lines 49-51.) In *Piersol*, determining whether the requested formatting operation is permitted, wherein determining whether the requested formatting operation is permitted comprises determining whether the new content contains at least one style that is not permitted to be applied to the contents of the electronic document is not disclosed. Rather *Piersol* merely discloses that limited access rights can be used to protect individual parts.

Piersol does not anticipate the claimed invention because *Piersol* at least does not disclose "determining whether the requested formatting operation is permitted, wherein determining whether the requested formatting operation is permitted comprises determining whether the new content contains at least one style that is not permitted to be applied to the contents of the electronic document," as recited by amended Claim 1. Accordingly, independent Claim 1 patentably distinguishes the present invention over the cited art, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of Claim 1.

Dependent Claims 2-4, 7-8, and 10-11 are also allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding independent Claim 1, and by virtue of their dependency upon independent Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 2-4, 7-8, and 10-11.

V. Rejection of the Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 2, 5-9, 12, and 17-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Piersol* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,088,711 ("*Fein*"). Claim 12 has been amended, and Applicants respectfully submit that the amendment overcomes this rejection and adds no new matter.

Amended Claim 12 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the reason that it recites, for example, "replacing styles contained in the electronic document that may not be applied with a style that may be applied in response to determining that styles that may not be applied should be removed."

As stated above, in contrast, *Piersol* at least does not disclose the aforementioned recitation. For example, *Piersol* merely discloses that individual parts can be protected with limited access rights. (See col. 18, lines 40-41.) For example, in *Piersol*, a document containing several different parts may be intended for distribution to a number of different categories of people. (See col. 18, lines 41-43.) Some of the parts in *Piersol* may contain confidential information that is not to be revealed to some categories of people. (See col. 18, lines 43-46.) These individual parts in *Piersol* can be protected with limited access rights, and their contents can be viewed only by those who have an appropriate password, or other form of access. (See col. 18, lines 46-49.)

In other words, *Piersol's* access restrictability is another characteristic property of a part. (See col. 18, lines 49-51.) In *Piersol*, replacing styles contained in an electronic document that may not be applied with a style that may be applied in response to determining that styles that may not be applied should be removed is not disclosed. Rather *Piersol* merely discloses that limited access rights can be used to protect individual parts.

Furthermore, *Fein* does not overcome *Piersol's* deficiencies. *Fein* discloses a method and system for defining and applying a style of a paragraph based upon the formatting properties of the paragraph. (See Abstract.) The paragraph type of the paragraph is identified. (See Abstract.) A determination is made whether the paragraph type is one which is capable of having a style defined for it. (See Abstract.) If not, then a determination is made whether the major formatting properties of the paragraph match those of an existing style and, if so, then the matching existing style is applied to the paragraph. (See Abstract.) If the paragraph type is one which is capable of having a style defined for it, then a determination is made whether the major formatting properties of the paragraph match those of an existing style with the same paragraph type as the paragraph type of the paragraph. (See Abstract.) If so, then the matching existing style is applied to the paragraph. (See Abstract.) If not, then a style is defined with the formatting properties of the paragraph. (See Abstract.) The defined style is then applied to the paragraph and all direct formatting is removed. (See Abstract.) Like *Piersol*, *Fein* at least does not teach or suggest replacing styles contained in an electronic document that may not be applied with a style that may be applied in response to determining that styles that may not be applied should be

removed. Rather *Fein* discloses a method and system for defining and applying a style of a paragraph based upon the formatting properties of the paragraph.

Combining *Piersol* with *Fein* would not have led to the claimed invention because *Piersol* and *Fein*, either individually or in combination, at least do not disclose or suggest "replacing styles contained in the electronic document that may not be applied with a style that may be applied in response to determining that styles that may not be applied should be removed," as recited by amended Claim 12. Accordingly, independent Claim 12 patentably distinguishes the present invention over the cited art, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of Claim 12.

Dependent Claims 13-18 are also allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding independent Claim 12, and by virtue of their dependency upon independent Claim 12. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 13-18.

VI. Allowance of Claims

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner pass Claims 19 and 20 to issue.

VII. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims. The preceding arguments are based only on the arguments in the Office Action, and therefore do not address patentable aspects of the invention that

were not addressed by the Examiner in the Office Action. The claims may include other elements that are not shown, taught, or suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, the preceding argument in favor of patentability is advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability. Furthermore, the Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
404.954.5066

/D. Kent Stier/

Date: October 29, 2007

D. Kent Stier
Reg. No. 50,640

DKS:mdc

